

file



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/697,731	10/25/2000	Daniel R. Cassiday	SUNIP410/P5326	4544

22434 7590 07/30/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP  
P.O. BOX 778  
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

CHUNG, PHUNG M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

8

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/697,731

Applicant(s)

CASSIDAY ET AL.

Examiner

Phung M. Chung

Art Unit

2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2133

1. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Line 3, "ONID vaule" is vague and indefinite. What is "ONID" stand for?

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35

Art Unit: 2133

U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson (6,209,112) in view of Computer Dictionary (Microsoft Press, second edition, "The comprehensive Standard for Business, School, Library, and Home", 1994, Pg. 114, col. 1, lines 1-6 from bottom to col. 2, lines 1-6).

Stevenson discloses the invention substantially as claimed, comprising the steps of:

Receiving an encoded data packet having a received CRC segment and a payload segment;

Calculating a first CRC value using the payload segment;

and comparing the first CRC and the received CRC thereby

determining whether the encoded message was received with

any errors. (See col. 2, lines 35-39, col. 4, lines 23-25,

lines 29- Stevenson does not disclose the steps of decoding

the first CRC using a plurality of inversion bits; and

decoding the received CRC using the plurality of inversion

bits. However, the Computer Dictionary discloses a decoder

for converting coded data back to its original form. (See

(Microsoft Press, second edition, "The comprehensive

Standard for Business, School, Library, and Home", 1994,

Pg. 114, col. 1, lines 1-6 from bottom to col. 2, lines 1-

Art Unit: 2133

6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the conversion of the decoder of the Computer Dictionary into the invention of Stevenson as desired.

5. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson (6,209,112) and the Computer Dictionary (Microsoft Press, second edition, "The comprehensive Standard for Business, School, Library, and Home", 1994, Pg. 114, col. 1, lines 1-6 from bottom to col. 2, lines 1-6) as applied to claims 8-15 above, and further in view of the admitted prior art.

As per claim 16, the teaching of Stevenson and the Computer Dictionary had been discussed above. They did not specifically disclose the payload segment contains 47 bits. However, the admitted prior art discloses that the payload segment contains 47 bits (pg. 2, line 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teaching of the admitted prior art, into the invention of Stevenson and the Computer Dictionary as desired to ensure that all packets are received.

Art Unit: 2133

As per claim 17, the teaching of Stevenson and the Computer Dictionary had been discussed above. They did not specifically disclose that the first CRC and the received CRC have 30 bits (pg. 2, line 11).

6. Claims 1-7 are allowable.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phung M. Chung whose telephone number is (703) 305-9686. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (every Monday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (703) 305-9595. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

  
PHUNG M. CHUNG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER